REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-34 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's withdrawal of the previous claim rejections. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the current rejections based on the following remarks.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-12, 14-20, 22-29 and 31-34 were rejected as being unpatentable over Rankin (US 6,879,838) in view of Wieczorek (US 6,125,278) .

Claims 5, 13, 21 and 30 were rejected as being unpatentable over Rankin and Wieczorek in view of Takagi.

Applicants respectfully assert that at the very least, Rankin and Wieczorek are legally deficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness against claims 1, 9, 17 and 26. Indeed, the claims rejections are seemingly based on an improper parsing of the claim language to fit the claims to the teachings of the reference but without due consideration given in the context of the claimed inventions.

For instance, claim 9 recites, in part,

a data source of event and time information representing a user's schedule . . .

a location database including resource information about [resources] *available for the user at one or more locations; and*

a predictor which receives the event and time information and the resource information to predict a location of the user and additional resources needed by the user at the predicted location . . .

The Examiner acknowledges on page 3 of the Final Action that Rankin does not teach the above claim limitations, but relies on Wieczorek to cure the deficiencies of Rankin in this regard. Applicants respectfully disagree. Wieczorek does not disclose or suggest *a predictor which*

receives the event and time information representing a user's schedule . . . to predict a location of the user. . . as recited in claim 9.

Wieczorek teaches a method of tracking a subscriber unit (a mobile wireless unit) and obtain location information supplied by the subscriber unit to predict a future location of the subscriber unit so that the system can allocate communication resources in anticipation of expected resource requirements for the subscriber unit at the predicted future location (e.g., resources needed for executing "hand-offs" as the user passes through different sites within the subscriber unit coverage area) (see, e.g., Col. 2, lines 10-24;, Col. 4, lines 50-65).

In this regard, Wieczorek clearly does not teach or suggest *a predictor which receives the event and time information representing a user's schedule . . . to predict a location of the user.* To begin, prediction is based solely on the location of the subscriber unit during *actual use* of the subscriber unit, for the purpose of providing resources needed by the subscriber unit while it is in operation. There is nothing in Wieczorek that suggests predicting the location of the user, *per se*, based on event and time information representing the user's schedule. The focus in Wieczorek is on the actual subscriber unit as it is being used, regardless of who is using the subscriber unit.

For instance, a family of four people can use a single mobile phone, for instance, at different times, but the Wieczorek system will only predict the location of the subscriber unit as it is being used, regardless, and without consideration of the user's schedule who is using the subscriber unit. Moreover, the Wieczorek system only predicts locations of the subscriber unit as it is being used within the coverage area of the communications system (Col. 4, lines 55-58). The Wieczorek system does not, and cannot, predict future locations while the subscriber unit is not being operated. For instance, Wieczorek does not teach or suggest a system that utilizes a user's

schedule to predicts that the user may be using the subscriber unit at some location in the future and ensure that resources are available at that predicted location for using the subscriber unit.

Further, with respect to claims 17 and 26, Wieczorek does not disclose or suggest *representing a user's schedule with event and time information . . .* and *predicting a location of the user and additional resources needed by the user at the predicted location based on the event and time*, for similar reasons discussed above.

Moreover, with respect to claim 1, the combination of Rankin and Wieczorek does not disclose *a universal messaging system coupled to the predictor, wherein the universal messaging system provides message services to the user based on predictions by the predictor of current or future locations, activities or needs of a user*, as recited in claim 1. In fact, the Final Action fails to address, and simply ignores this limitation. In this regard, the Final Action fails to present a prima facie case of obviousness against claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, claims 1, 9, 17 and 26 are patentable and nonobvious over the combination of Rankin and Wieczorek. In addition, all claims that depend from claim 1, 9, 17 and 26 are patentable and nonobvious over the combination of Rankin and Wieczorek or the combination of Rankin and Wieczorek and Tagaki at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1, 9, 17 and 26. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

~~Respectfully~~ submitted,

Frank V. DeRosa
Reg. No. 43,584

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL.: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889